



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/475,319	12/30/1999	BRIAN G. DUPERROUZEL	520044.403	6201

500 7590 02/14/2003

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 6300
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/475,319	DUPERROUZEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 11/07/2002.
2. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12 and 25 are independent claims.

In the Amendment A, claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-24 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-15, 18-19, 21-27 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. ("Adams", US 6,237,030) in view of Staab (US 5,499,334).

As per independent claim 1 and claims 5 and 6, which are both dependent on claim 1, Adams teaches a display system, including a display screen, to display web pages accessible via a network (Abstract, lines 1-3), the display system comprising:

a computer system structured to send a request for a web page via the network to a web site (col.8, line 67; col.9, lines 1-4), the computer system structured to receive the web page via the network from the web site (col.9, lines 36-39);

a display processor, responsive to display area controls associated with a display area on the display screen, to display the web page received by the computer system, the display area controls being responsive to a user to select characteristics of the web page to display in the display area (col.11, lines 6-11; *bookmark*);

a storage area to store the user-selected characteristics of the web page displayed in the display area, wherein if the computer system sends a subsequent request to the web site for the web page, the display processor uses the stored control information and the display area displays the web page received in response to the subsequent request in accordance with the user-selected characteristics of the web page (col.4, lines 48-52).

Wherein the computer system sends the subsequent request to the web site in response to a recall of the stored control information and wherein the computer system recalls the stored control information in response to the subsequent request (col.11, lines 19-21).

However, Adams does not disclose the display area controls being responsive to a user to select display area configuration settings of the display area to thereby select characteristics to display, and a storage area that stores the selected display area configuration settings. Staab discloses the display area controls being responsive to a user to select display area configuration settings of the display area to thereby select characteristics to display (col. 3, lines 59-67 through col. 4, lines 1-36), and a storage area that stores the selected display area configuration settings (col. 4, lines 60-65 and col. 11, lines 56). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching from Staab of the display area controls being responsive to a user to select display area configuration settings of the display area to thereby select characteristics to display, and a storage area that stores the selected display area configuration settings in Adams's display system since it would allow the user to generate various display configurations.

As per claim 4, Adams teaches the display system wherein the display area controls include addressing controls, the addressing controls being structured to allow the user to store an address of the displayed web page in the storage area for use during the subsequent request (col.4, lines 51-56).

As per claim 7, Adams teaches the display system wherein the display area controls include sizing controls, the sizing controls being structured to allow the user to change a size of the display area (col.6, lines 6-7). However, Adams dose not disclose the display system wherein the display area controls include sizing controls, the sizing controls being structured to allow the user to change a size of the display area and store the size as one of the display area configuration settings. Stabb discloses the display system wherein the display area controls include sizing controls, the sizing controls being structured to allow the user to change a size of the display area (col. 3, lines 67 through col. 4, lines 1-6 and col. 5, lines 30-39) and store the size as one of the display area configuration settings (col. 3, lines 59-67 through col. 4, lines 1-36 and col. 4, lines 60-65 and col. 11, lines 56). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention was made to use the teaching from Staab of the display system wherein the display area controls include sizing controls, the sizing controls being structured to allow the user to change a size of the display area and store the size as one of the display area configuration settings of Adams's display system since it would allow the user to generate various display configurations.

As per claim 9, Adams teaches the display system wherein the control information includes user-selected menu settings (col.5, lines 38-42).

Claims 10, 19 and 22 are individually similar in scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 11, Adams teaches the display system wherein the display processor automatically processes the stored display area configuration settings prior to displaying the user-selected characteristics of the web page (the last limitation paragraph of claim 1).

As per claims 12 and 15, the limitations contained therein have been previously addressed in claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13-14 are similar in scope to claims 5-6 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 30 are individually similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21 and 32 are individually similar in scope to claim 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23, 27 and 33 are individually similar in scope to claim 11, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 12, Adams teaches the display system further comprising a plurality of display areas configured to simultaneously display a corresponding plurality of web pages in accordance with corresponding user-selected characteristics of the web pages, the display system further comprising:

a storage area storing display area configuration settings corresponding to each display area; and,

a display processor coupled to the storage area and structured to subsequently recall the stored display area configuration settings corresponding to each display area to simultaneously display the web pages in accordance with the user-selected characteristics of the web pages (col.11, lines 20-25).

As per independent claim 25, it is similar in scope to independent claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, it is similar in scope to claim 24, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 25, Adams teaches the method wherein requesting a web page comprises connecting to an Internet network (col.10, lines 61-65).

5. Claims 2, 8, 16, 20, 28, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (“Adams”, US 6,237,030) in view of Staab (US 5,499,334) as applied to claims 1, 12, and 25 and further in view of Morimura et al (“Morimura” US 6,072,474).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, modified Adams does not disclose the display area controls to include positioning controls being structured to allow the user to select positioning settings of the display area configuration settings to thereby select a user-selected portion of the display. Morimura discloses that in col. 20, lines 42-67 through col. 21, lines 1-3. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Morimura of the display area controls to include positioning controls being structured to allow the user to select positioning settings of the display area configuration settings to thereby select a user-selected portion of the display in Adams’s web page display system since it would provide more efficiency by reducing the time the user would take to return to the state at which the user left off.

Claims 8, 16, 20, 28, and 34 are individually similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 3, 17, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (“Adams”, US 6,237,030) in view of Staab (US 5,499,334) as applied to claims 1, 12, and 25 and further in view of Matthews, III et al. (“Matthews”, US 6,344,865).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, modified Adams teaches the display of web pages in response to display area controls associated with user-selected characteristics. However, Adams fails to teach the display area controls to include screen resolution controls to adjust screen resolution settings of the display area configuration settings to thereby a screen resolution of the display screen. Matthews teaches the adjustment of the screen resolution of a display screen (col.11, lines 14-15). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Matthews teaching with Adams display system to adjust the display area to accommodate to the user's viewing level and/or preference.

Claims 17 and 29 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to Amendment A have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquires

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2174

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
February 3, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100